

Appl. No.: 10/790,498
Response to Office communication dated: 05/30/2007
Attorney Docket: UCONAP/226/US

REMARKS

Claims 21-35 are being added. Claims 1-4, 10, 12, and 15-20 are being cancelled without prejudice to filing in a subsequent application. Claims 5-9, 11 and 13-14 are being amended. Upon entry of this amendment claims 5-9, 11, 13-14 and 21-30 will be pending in the application.

The amendment to claims 5-9 is supported by the respective claim as filed.

The amendment to claim 11 is supported by that claim as filed.

The amendment to claim 13 is supported by the specification at, for example, page 30, lines 4-11 disclosing use of an excipient, a vehicle, an adjuvant, a flavoring, a colorant, or a preservative and page 42, lines 1-5; page 47, line 27; page 49, line 26-27; page 51, lines 1-2; page 52, line 22; each disclosing isolation and purification of compounds.

The amendment to claim 14 is supported by that claim as filed.

New claim 21 is supported by the specification and as filed claim 1.

New claims 22-30 are supported by the specification and as filed claim 1.

New claims 31-35 are supported by claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 14 respectively and replace use of a reference numeral with the corresponding structure.

The amendments and new claims add no new matter.

Examiner Interview.

Applicant thanks Examiner Saeed for the courtesy shown during the telephone conference on August 8, 2007. Applicant attaches hereto an Examiner Interview Summary describing the telephone conference between Examiner Saeed and Mr. Piotrowski on that date.

The pending restriction.

This application was the subject of a restriction. Applicant elected a specific species and proposed a family of compounds encompassing that species.

Appl. No.: 10/790,498

Response to Office communication dated: 05/30/2007

Attorney Docket: UCONAP/226/US

The Office communication mailed after Applicant's election stated that the examined family of compounds was restricted to R4 being -Ph-(CH₂)_n-Z where n is 0 and Z represents a heterocyclic group. The restricted compounds in the Office communication did not encompass the R4 moiety for either the specific species or the family of compounds proposed by Applicant.

During the August 8, 2007 telephone conference (summary attached) agreement was reached concerning the scope of the examined claims. Applicant has amended the claims to stay within the agreed scope.

The rejection of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for use of the transitional term "comprises". Without agreeing to the propriety of this rejection Applicant has replaced the transitional term "comprises" with --is-- or --is selected from--. This rejection is obviated.

The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 14, and presumably claims 6-9, were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite for referencing structures in the specification. Applicant has replaced the structure numbers with the respective structures. This rejection is obviated.

Space intentionally blank.

Appl. No.: 10/790,498

Response to Office communication dated: 05/30/2007

Attorney Docket: UCONAP/226/US

In summary, Applicants have addressed each of the rejections within the present Office Action. It is believed the application now stands in condition for allowance, and prompt favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 860 527 9211 if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexandros Makriyannis et al

Date: November 30, 2007
750 Main Street – Suite 1400
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211

By: Guy D. Yale
Registration No. 29,125
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicants